



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

3. An agreement of the States forming the society of nations concerning the call and procedure of the Conference, by which that institution shall become not only internationalized, but in which no nation shall take as of right a preponderating part.

4. The appointment of a committee, to meet at regular intervals between the conferences, charged with the duty of procuring the ratification of the conventions and declarations and of calling attention to the conventions and declarations in order to insure their observance.

5. An understanding upon certain fundamental principles of international law, as set forth in the declaration of the rights and duties of nations adopted by the American Institute of International Law on January 6, 1916, which are themselves based upon decisions of English courts and of the Supreme Court of the United States.

6. The creation of an international council of conciliation to consider, to discuss, and to report upon such questions of a non-justiciable character as may be submitted to such council by an agreement of the powers for this purpose.

7. The employment of good offices, mediation, and friendly composition, for the settlement of disputes of a non-justiciable nature.

8. The principle of arbitration in the settlement of disputes of a non-justiciable nature; also of disputes of a justiciable nature which should be decided by a court of justice, but which have, through delay or mismanagement, assumed such political importance that the nations prefer to submit them to arbiters of their own choice rather than to judges of a permanent judicial tribunal.

9. The negotiation of a convention creating a judicial union of the nations along the lines of the Universal Postal Union of 1906, to which all civilized nations and self-governing dominions are parties, pledging the good faith of the contracting parties to submit their justiciable disputes—that is to say, their differences involving law or equity—to a permanent court of this union, whose decisions will bind not only the litigating nations, but also all parties to its creation.

10. The creation of an enlightened public opinion in behalf of peaceable settlement in general, and in particular in behalf of the foregoing nine propositions, in order that, if agreed to, they may be put into practice and become effective, in response to the appeal to that greatest of sanctions, "a decent respect to the opinion of mankind."*

WHY DID NOT THE CHURCH PREVENT THE WAR?

By JAMES H. ECOB

WHEN war was declared the world was stunned with horror. Men everywhere saw that a conflagration had started whose ravages no one could prophesy. What we felt to be impossible had happened. The second breath of thought, after the shock, was shaped in the question which came in from all the nations, "*What has the Church been doing that this thing could happen?*"

The question came instinctively, for the world had a right to ask that the nations which had been under direct tutelage of the Church for centuries should show due respect for the fundamental principles of the Christian religion. If the Christian world is today face to face with the greatest moral debacle of human history, how can we avoid the question, What has the Church been doing? What place can we find for Christ in this last day of Christian history? We make motion-picture films of a shadowy Christ drifting among the horrors of our battlefields. But where was our Christ

before the battles? How are such fields of horror possible in a world where we fondly say, Christ has been embodied in his Church for nearly two thousand years? What questions so instant and imperative as these? Unless a sane and adequate answer is found, what of the future? Is the Church to go serenely on in its old beaten pathway, and leave the nations, "groping and stumbling in disastrous night," to organize another Armageddon of woe tenfold deeper in human misery and moral degradation? All such questions are futile unless the Church is to use them as a lash to her conscience. "If my path has led the nations to this quagmire of mud and blood, then from this hour I must choose a new and plain path. I must stop doing the things which for centuries I have been doing, and forthwith begin doing different things. Or else frankly admit, I have no message of guidance and redemption for the nations."

The question, What has the Church been doing? applies of course to the older nations now engaged in war. They have been for centuries under the direct tutelage of the Church. The question must consequently be narrowed to those nations which have made the history now blossoming in the blood-red horrors of the world's greatest calamity. Turkey, Russia, France, Germany, England—what has the Church been doing in these countries?

The story of the Church in Turkey is known and read of all men. A State Church, born of the sword, with garments rolled in blood, autocratic, aristocratic, her subjects a byword and hissing throughout the world, the "Unspeakable Turk."

Russia is probably more heavily overchurched than any of the nominally Christian countries. Every man there who thinks he has had some success in life must celebrate by building a memorial church. In the magnificence of its sacred buildings, in its vast landed properties, in astounding accumulations of gold and silver and precious stones, the Greek Church is easily chief.

Peter the Great, among his manifold and bizarre activities, turned the Russian Church into a department of the State. "From that hour it ceased to live. It was part of the bureaucratic machine for exploiting the people, for enabling a vast army of officials to make a living, and to exercise an irresponsible authority over the masses." This action was stoutly resisted at the time by the plain people, and is today a standing menace to the liberties of that distracted country. What has the Greek Church done for Russia? Precisely what all the other autocratic, aristocratic institutions have done. Its boast is that its doctrines have not changed since the great councils of the early centuries. It is without doubt today the richest and most securely anchored in absolutism of any ecclesiastical organization in the world. It is giving the torn and vexed multitudes such profound and commanding laws as this: "You may worship images, but they must be flat. To worship a statute or bas-relief is idolatry, abhorrent to Mother Church. You must have sacred pictures with perpetual lights before them, but they must be in the corners of your rooms, which are more sacred than the side walls." Accordingly, nearly every room in Russia, public as well as private, has its inevitable

* The text of this Declaration of Rights and Duties, and of the Recommendations of Havana has been carried since the war began in every number of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE, under the caption "A Governed World."

picture and candle in the corner. To the first question, What has the Church done to prevent war in Russia? we must add the equally significant question, What has the Church done to prevent the present anarchy in that unhappy country?

France and Italy may be placed side by side in this inquiry. They both for centuries have been under the sway of a State Church. The feudal system of the middle ages needs no rehearsal. "Bishops and abbots became feudal dignitaries, sometimes almost sovereign princes in their own domains, and always with a potent voice in the government of their own nation.

"The Pope became a sovereign over a large part of Italy, and his material power and spiritual influence were so vast that he could wrestle on even terms for supremacy with the emperors. The Church was the sole schoolmistress of the raw peoples. The Church had its own law code and its own courts of law which were supreme over the clergy and had large rights of jurisdiction over the laity, so that it could develop and give effect to its own ideas of law and right. Throughout the middle ages the sway of the Church over the moral and spiritual life of the people, her power to inspire and direct their enthusiasms and energies, her chance for moulding their conceptions of life, were amazing and unparalleled by any other force." (Rauschenbush.) Yet the inquisition story touches some of the most unspeakable depths in both those countries. When Bartholomew's treachery and slaughter were completed in France, Rome struck a medal in commemoration of the joyful event. In the face of history one is ashamed to ask, What has the Church done to prevent war in those countries? Has it not become a historical byword that religious wars are ever the most implacable and vengeful of wars? Here is the same old story, autocracy, aristocracy, power and riches. The same boast that the doctrines of the Church have not changed in centuries, the same gorgeous rituals, the same magnificent sacred buildings and the same ignorance and poverty and superstition of the common people.

In England, again, is the well-known historical record. The facts assert themselves against all debate and question. England for centuries has been under the penetrating and powerful tutelage of a State Church. Her bishops are *Lord Bishops*, who hold that most deadly of political weapons, the veto. Within two years they have used that weapon to defeat national prohibition, during the war. "We do not deem it necessary to give up our wine." Education, social custom, civic ideals, have been for centuries largely under the domination of the established church. What has that Church done to prevent war in England. Let the story of the "far flung" empire answer. How gladly would the best Englishmen as well as we, her children, wipe out many pages of that history. What results do we see today? The ancient city of York has something more to say to the world than the awe-struck reports of tourists who enter her matchless cathedral. Here is the bishop's palace. His salary equals that of our President. He has retinues of servants, he has a vote in the

House of Lords. Yet about one-third of the inhabitants of York must receive charitable aid to get through the year alive. 1,300,000 persons in London live below the poverty line. What help can you expect from such abject and starveling multitudes to shape the national ideals for peace and righteousness and good will? Here the two records lie open to the sun. He who runs may read—the "profane" history and the "sacred." Which is which? Four years ago my son and I, through a little American traveler's wit, had one of the greatest English cathedrals, with its equally great organ, all to ourselves. It seemed as if the forest of mighty pillars were shaken by the storm of music like trees in the wind. The great historic building, its vastness, the glory of its stained light, the tremendous upwardsweep and power of its lines and the storming organ were almost more than one could bear. The next morning we went to the full service. There were the building and the organ and the vested choir of priests and boys. But where were the people? My son and I were there, one poor little old woman huddled in a corner, and one forlorn old man, out of whom had evidently gone every earthly hope. Where were the people? We went out from that service utterly dejected and heartsick, Tenyson's bitter words sounding in our hearts, "splendidly null, splendidly null." Is this sort of thing going on all over England? Is it a case of religion for religion's sake? Here the tiresome old history is repeating itself. Ancient doctrines, unchanged and unchangeable, a governing class, aristocratic ideals and practice, stately, imposing buildings, magnificent ritual, riches, power, social prestige. The people! Sheep without a shepherd! except as they are branded with that detestable word, "non-conformist," and, by the condescending tolerance of Mother Church, allowed to build such chapels as they can afford, and listen to preachers who are not in the "Apostolic line."

Germany, the land of Luther. One can hardly repress the cry, "Lucifer, thou son of the morning, how are thou fallen!" What has the Church been doing in Germany that today she is enclosed in a ring of iron by the civilized world like some insane creature or wild beast? What has the Church been doing that sixty of her foremost teachers and leaders could send out a manifesto so crude and vulgar in its common street language and temper that one blushed to read it? Germany has given the world its only hymn of hate. Her preachers have sent out books of sermons so raw and shameless that you throw the book down in disgust as if you had come suddenly upon something morally and spiritually obscene. Germany has stripped her soul in the sight of the nations and they have turned from her in loathing and contempt. At the head of Church and State is a man who has so borne himself by "Divine Right" that history has been ransacked for all its most detestable names to apply to him. For forty years Luther's Germany has devoted itself to the perfecting of the most gigantic slaughtering machine ever pictured to the human imagination. Wordsworth's scornful words written a hundred years ago are literal truth today.

"What is it but a vain and curious skill
 If sapient Germany must lie deprest,
 Beneath the brutal sword? Her haughty schools
 Shall blush; and may not we with sorrow say,
 A few strong instincts and a few plain rules,
 Among the herdsmen of the Alps, have wrought
 More for mankind at this unhappy day
 Than all her pride of intellect and thought?"

We must keep steadily in mind the question with which we started. Why did not the Church prevent this war? This is the question which the world instinctively asked, as if it were a matter of course that the Church which has had under tutelage for centuries the nations engaged in the war should have so moulded their thought that this world horror would have been simply unthinkable in the twentieth century. Accordingly, in our swift outline sketch of church influence in the warring countries we have asked only for those facts which bear directly upon an answer to our question.

We find that the Church through the principal nations of Christian civilization have given the world two words. They are these: *Doctrinalism* and *Ecclesiasticism*. It is today the boast of these great State churches that their doctrines and forms have remained practically unchanged from the beginning. The story that runs, *pari passu*, through history with doctrinalism is the record of the long warfare of the Church to build itself up in external power and magnificence and wealth. In both of these records we find adequate answer to our question why the Church did not prevent the war. In fact, has not the Church as a warrior made some of the most dark and bloody chapters in history?

Just at this point the practical question is upon us insistent and imperative. What do we Christian men of the twentieth century propose to do about it? If the past teaching and life of the Church have landed the nations in this hopeless depth of disaster, it certainly seems to be plain that we cannot go on in the old way. If the doctor's regimen has killed his patient, he is hardly less than a homicide to continue that treatment upon other patients. The world's question, What has the Church been doing? is inversely a demand that whatever it has been doing it shall forthwith stop it and begin a different order of treatment. If the Church hopes to prevent in the future a recurrence of the present state of things it must at once and finally substitute for the words *doctrinalism* and *ecclesiasticism* the two words *righteousness* and *humanity*. Righteousness, simple right dealing between individuals and nations. Humanity, everything pertaining to human welfare. "*Nothing human is foreign to me,*" must be the underlying and informing principle in the entire cycle of Church activities. If the Church proposes to prevent another world-disaster greater than the present, it must speedily bring the nations under a sane, authoritative Christian tutelage. The Church must itself go back to the simplicity of statement and conduct which has made the ministry of Christ a redemptive power in the world. Her senseless and divisive denominationalism must be cast out, root and branch. She must stop her foolish and wasteful imitation of

heathen temples and mediæval cathedrals in her church buildings. Over against her elaborate, philosophical creeds she must set the one great name which Christ gave us, Father. In that same word she must read, with the same deep reverence, the word, Brother, for every human being on the face of the earth. When the Church has said from the heart, Father, to God, her place and mission to humanity is defined with absolute clearness and enforced by the sanctions of Divinity itself.

When peace returns, a world racked and torn and wasted, plucked bodily out of its historic setting, will be in no mood to hear the old "song of one that hath a pleasant voice and can play well on an instrument." No. The nations will demand a strong and steady hand to bind up their wounds and a clear voice of wisdom and authority to direct their bewildered steps into a plain path.

MILITARISM, PACIFISM, AND THE WAR

By JOSEPH JASTROW

Professor of Psychology, University of Wisconsin

[The following are selections from the final chapter of Professor Jastrow's latest work, "The Psychology of Conviction," just published by Houghton Mifflin Co., New York and Boston, here printed with special permission of the author. With regret that lack of space prohibited more lengthy quotations, the effort has been to give the gist of this interesting and thoughtful chapter in the author's own words, and without garbling the significance of the whole. Considerable elisions are indicated in the usual manner. For a more complete and adequate presentation of Professor Jastrow's point of view, the reader is referred to his book.—THE EDITOR.]

IN the perspective of the day the conflict between militarism and pacifism occupies the commanding position. The world-war makes it the supreme controversy of our generation. Yet the champions of the opposed positions are not inclined to show their colors unmistakably. The hesitation has a one-sided source. In profession all, or nearly all, are pacifists; nobody wants war; few defend it unreservedly as an institution; many regard it as inherent in human nature, and the preparation for it a prudent national insurance against disaster; there is a further fear that its removal as a contingency would weaken the social structure and tradition and relax the virile energies of men. The pacifists who come in overwhelming numbers to enlist in the cause of peace show a divergence of principle and measures that divides them as sharply as those who hesitate to join their ranks. The articles of faith to which the two parties respectively subscribe are at times much the same, and as often quite incompatible. A liberal pacifist may be a close and not uncongenial neighbor to a mild militarist. The extreme militarist regards the extreme pacifist as an obstinate and misguided enemy to the nation and the nation's cause, and the unlovely estimate of the tendency of the opposed view is cordially reciprocated. There would appear to be a radical divergence and a sharp controversy. Yet, when summoned to debate, the two parties are commonly bent upon conciliation—upon a middle road of moderation and compromise leading to a com-